

## **REMARKS**

In the Office Action dated January 31, 2003, claims 6-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite because the Examiner stated clarification was needed as to the structural arrangement of the two electrically separate circuits in independent claim 6. Support in the original disclosure for the circuits being formed at one or more discrete electrical components is present in the abstract and in original claim 1, which is a part of the disclosure. The fact that one of the circuits receives a power supply voltage and the other is intended for connection to a patient sensor is described at page 1 of the present specification, wherein the purpose of the isolation barrier is described, this isolation barrier being formed by isolation transformers of the type set forth in claim 6. Additionally, the specification at page 6, line 23 through page 7, line 7 describes the particular coupling of an electrical circuit and a winding as set forth in claim 10.

Claim 6 is therefore submitted to be in full compliance with all provisions of Section 112, second paragraph.

The Examiner also noted a lack of antecedent basis in claim 8, and this has been corrected by changing claim 8 to depend from claim 7, wherein proper antecedent basis is provided.

Claims 6 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kuroki. Claims 7, 8 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuroki in view of Billings.

These rejections are respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

The transformer disclosed in the Kuroki reference is a planar transformer having a multi-layer printed circuit board arrangement, formed by layers 7, 8 and 9.

The Kuroki reference, therefore, does not disclose all of the elements of independent claim 6 as arranged and operating in that claim, and therefore does not anticipate claim 6. Claim 9 adds further structure to the novel combination of claim 6, and therefore is not anticipated by the Kuroki reference for the same reasons discussed in connection with claim 6.

As to the rejection of claims 6, 7 and 10 based on the teachings of Kuroki and Billings, the same comments above with respect to the Kuroki reference apply. Since each of those claims embodies the subject matter of claim 6 therein, and since the subject matter of claim 6 is not disclosed in the Kuroki reference, even if the Kuroki structure were modified in accordance with the teachings of Billings, the subject matter of claims 7, 8 and 10 still would not result.

Moreover, the Billings reference discloses a transformer wherein the primary winding and the secondary winding are separable, with the secondary winding being embedded in a thin plastic transaction card, and the primary winding being wound on a bobbin of a separate transformer primary section. Only when the card is inserted into a reader, as shown in Figure 1 and as described at column 2, lines 46-68 of the Billings reference, is a complete transformer formed.

Billings requires that the secondary winding be flexible and thin, as described at column 2, lines 22-30, and Billings further teaches that such a winding can be formed by a conductor run using printed circuit board technology, or can be formed by a flat bobbin-less coil. This is described in column 3, lines 48-65 of the Billings reference, and also is shown in Figure 3 thereof. Since the primary winding is contained in the reader, there are no size or space limitations relating thereto, and

therefore the primary winding can be formed by a number of turns of wire wound on a bobbin.

The object of the Kuroki reference is to produce a small, thin transformer, and this is achieved by forming the windings by means of a combination of both printed circuit technology and structural winding on a flat bobbin-less coil. The mere fact that the Billings reference teaches that the primary winding, wherein no flexibility or thinness requirements apply, is a bobbin winding does not constitute a teaching to those of ordinary skill in the art to substitute such a bobbin winding either for the printed circuit board runs or the flat bobbin-less coil in the Kuroki reference. As noted above, the only reason why the Billings reference is able to use a bobbin coil at all is because this coil is present in the reader, wherein the aforementioned thinness and flexibility requirements do not apply. In the Kuroki reference, by contrast, it is the goal to achieve a thin transformer, which is why no bobbin coil is used in that reference at all. It would therefore destroy the intended operation of the Kuroki reference to substitute a bobbin coil for either of the coil formed by the conductor runs or the bobbin-less coil.

Claims 7, 8 and 10, therefore, would not have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art based on the teachings of Kuroki and Billings.

All claims of the application are therefore submitted to be in condition for allowance, and early reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Submitted by,

*Steven H. Noll*

(Reg. 28,982)

SCHIFF, HARDIN & WAITE

**CUSTOMER NO. 26574**

Patent Department

6600 Sears Tower

233 South Wacker Drive

Chicago, Illinois 60606

Telephone: 312/258-5790

Attorneys for Applicants.

CH1\ 4005980.1